

## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the phone interview conducted on Nov. 3, 2004. In the interview, prior art references *Ohgami* and *Dudas* were discussed. Particularly, that *Ohgami* discloses double sided tape and not glue as required by claim 9, and that *Dudas* is directed at memory cards and not computers as required by the claim 30. No agreement was reached in the interview.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 12, 14, 18, 19 and 30 under 35 USC 102.

Claims 5-8, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24-29, 31, 58, 63-71, 73 have been allowed.

Claims 9, 15 and 16 have been amended. Claims 12, 13 and 30 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 5-9, 14-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31, 58 and 63-71, and 73 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102***

**Claims 9, 12, 14, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ohgami* et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,574,625).**

The rejections are moot based on the amendments above. Particularly, in order to expedite the prosecution of this case, claim 9 was amended to include the limitations of allowed claim 13 and intervening claim 12.

It should be noted that the Applicant still believes that the previous claim 9 should be allowed, and that the Applicant reserves the right to go after these claims in a continuing application. For example, in contrast to *Ohgami*, claim 9 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a glue disposed between the casing and the frame, the glue structurally attaching the casing and frame to form a singular composite structure..." While *Ohgami* may disclose fixing

cover 18 to flange 61, *Ohgami* does not teach or suggest using a glue to attach the cover 18 to the flange 18. In *Ohgami*, the cover 18 is fixed to the flange 61 with double sided tape 62 and double sided tape is not glue. It is therefore believed that the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

**Claims 9, 12, 14, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Difonzo et al* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,574,096).**

The rejections are moot based on the amendments above. Particularly, claim 9 was amended to include the limitations of allowed claim 13 and intervening claim 12 in order to expedite the prosecution of this case.

**Claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Dudas et al* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,946,194).**

Claim 30 was cancelled in order to expedite the prosecution of the case and therefore the rejection is moot.

Although cancelled, it should be noted that the Applicant still believes that claim 30 should be allowed, and that the Applicant reserves the right to go after these claims in a continuing application. Particularly, *Dudas* does not teach or suggest, “A component of a computer enclosure comprising...the casing and the frame are configured to at least partially enclose parts of a computing device...” as required by claim 30. It should be emphasized that *Dudas* is directed at memory cards and not computing devices such as portable computers as in the present invention. It also doesn’t appear that *Dudas* teaches or suggests, “...a conductive bridge electrically bonding the first and second conductive surfaces and electrically sealing an interface between the first and second conductive surfaces so as to form a singular conductive structure for shielding electronic emissions...,” as required by claim 30. It is therefore believed that the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 5-8, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24-29, 31, 58, 63-71, 73 have been allowed. In addition, claim 9 has been amended to include the limitations of allowed dependent claim 13 and intervening claim 12. Furthermore, allowed dependent claim 15 was amended to include the limitations of independent claim 9. No new material was added in either amendment. Claims 9 and 15 (and their dependents) are therefore allowable as the Examiner indicated allowable subject matter in the previous Office Action.

***Summary***

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Quin C. Hoellwarth  
Reg. No. 45,738

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300